

## **FIRE PROGRAM ANALYSIS (FPA) PROJECT**

### **PROGRESS REPORT**

July 11, 2002

This is the first in a regular series of progress reports for the Fire Program Analysis (FPA) Project. This project (originally known as FireMAP) will develop an interagency, integrated analysis tool to support planning and budgeting for the entire scope of fire management activities including protection (initial attack, extended attack, large fire support), fuels management (both mechanical and prescribed fire), fire use and prevention.

The first phase of the project is focus on developing the preparedness module.

### **Key Tasks & Events**

New Name – At the insistence of the Congressional Appropriations Committee, we have renamed the project from the original FireMAP to the Fire Program Analysis (FPA) Project.

History - The official project start date is May 15, 2002. This is when we learned that the Appropriations Committee would include language in the FY2003 Appropriations Bill directing the five federal wildland fire management agencies “to design and develop a focused automated system for preparedness resource planning to replace the systems currently in use by the fire management agencies. The Committee directs that the agencies deliver quarterly progress reports that describe the project status and provide updated cost information.”

Memorandum of Understanding – The five fire directors signed an MOU mutually agreeing to pursue implementation of the recommendations of the Hubbard Report. The MOU further agrees to initially pursue implementation of a common preparedness system by September 2004.

Core Team Status - The FPA Core Team consists of

- Project Manager (Dan Keller- FS)
- Lead Business Analyst (Howard Roose – BLM)
- FS Business Expert (Advertisement on the street. Liz Wright is acting.)
- NPS Business Expert (Advertisement pending. Bill Kaage & Amanda Kaplan are acting)
- FWS Business Expert (FWS Fire Director has the cert. Selection pending. Mike Phillips is acting)
- BIA Business Expert (Advertisement pending. Scott Bradshaw is acting)

The project core team is meeting regularly to develop the charter and the initial architecture.

Project Web Site - A project web site is under development to provide a source of information about the project including the overall architecture and design, contact information, project management information and, eventually, access to the FPA System modules.

Contracts - A contract with SOZA, Inc. is being pursued for assistance with project initiation and initial architecture, requirements and design. This contract will go a long way towards getting technical approval and OMB project acceptance.

Project Charter – The FPA Core Team is preparing a project charter. This draft is expected to be distributed for review, comment and signature by the first of August.

### **Issues**

Timeframe imposed by Congress - The Congressional Appropriations Committee has placed a constraint of completing the preparedness module by September 2004. This is a very ambitious time frame. In order to meet that timeframe, it will be imperative to manage the overall architecture and scope of work for this first phase.

There is concern that if we do not meet this timeframe that we will not be able to proceed toward our ultimate goal of developing a landscape level, fire planning and analysis tool that considers the interactions of all components of the fire management program, i.e., preparedness, large fire support, fuels management, prevention, rehab and restoration.

Project Core Team – Progress is being made on filling the core team positions on a full time basis. The acting core team members are making positive contributions to the project. The acting team members are filling in on a part time basis. Progress will be slower until the full time team is in place.

### **Risks**

A formal risk management plan is being prepared to highlight events that seek to delay the schedule, increase the cost and impact the deliverables. We will take action to mitigate those risk events with the greatest severity.

Key risks being addressed right now include:

Technical Approvals – In order to award a contract for the FPA System development, we must have technical approval. The technical approval process is evolving as agencies move from the old “request and approve” mode to the more rigorous “Capital Planning and Investment Control” (CPIC) process. This process is much more involved and requires much more work up front to justify the investment at the agency, department and OMB levels. The complexity is compounded by the need to work with both the USDA and the USDI.

Contracting – The most important project decision after the selection of the core team members will be the selection of our contractor. Failure to select a quality, qualified contractor will impair the project for years to come.

Budgeting and Funding – In order to award a task order to the contractor funding must be in place. Limited funds are available in FY’02 to initiate the contract. If funding is delayed in FY’03 due to a series of continuing resolutions, proceeding to contract development may be delayed.



## **FPA TOP 10 RISKS**

July 18, 2002

Rank	Probability	Impact	Severity	Risk Event	risk group	Description	Mitigation
1	0.8	9	7.2	The scope of the project exceeds the ability to produce it within the timeframes and funding constraints.			Clearly define scope. Estimate effort using CostXpert. Reduce scope to complete within timeframes and budgets.
2	0.8	8	6.4	The schedule slips.		Schedule is too optimistic.	Manage the scope to coordinate budgets and schedules. Practice disciplined project management. Develop detailed project plans with tasks assigned to individuals. Break down build into small iterations. Monitor performance.
3	0.9	5	4.5	Changes in policy or business requirements dicatate changes need to be made to the FPA software.	biz	FPA enforces policy and business rules. If the policy or business changes, the FPA software will have to be changed also.	Policy changes should follow strict change management control in the context of the FPA project.
4	0.9	5	4.5	Designing and developing the system for interagency use across multiple platform architectures causes delays and bugs.	sys		Utilize least common denominator platform, e.g., xml, java.
5	0.6	7	4.2	The project team is not formed in a timely manner. Delays in defining the business and architecture result.			
6	0.6	6	3.6	One or more key individuals, e.g., Roose, Botti, leaves the project.	org	The departure of key individuals could jeopardize the scucces of FPA. Key corporate knowledge would be lost.	Develop individuals to respond to gaps in service from key members of the team. Establish depth in the FPA organization

<b>7</b>	0.5	7	3.5	FY'03 funding is not sufficient to complete the initial build in time to implement by September 2004		If software is not basically operational by December 2003, implementing by Sept 2004 is not likely.	Mange scope to ensure that effort does not exceed available resource. Implement disciplined project scheduling and planning principles and practices.
<b>8</b>	0.5	7	3.5	The technical approval process prevents us from obtaining contractor resources in a timely manner. The schedule slips.			Organize meeting of FS-CIO, USDA-OCIO and project sponsors. Make sure that the direction from Congress and OMB is understood. Complete Exhibit 300 ASAP.
<b>9</b>	0.5	7	3.5	We are unable to establish consensus between the 5 federal fire agencies on the business process. The schedule slips.			Establish new business processes early in the life cycle. Communicate effectively with management and user community.
<b>10</b>	0.4	8	3.2	The user community (Fire Planners) are not supportive of the result.			Involve user community in development of new business process. Focus efforts on opinion leaders.